

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
SPARTANBURG DIVISION

Douglas B. Drake, Sr.,	)	C.A. No. 7:02-2604-TLW-BHH
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	ORDER
	)	
Aetna Life Insurance Company,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

This action has been filed by the plaintiff, who is now proceeding *pro se*. This matter is now before the undersigned for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Bruce H. Hendricks, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). In her Report, Magistrate Judge Hendricks recommends that the judgment of the defendant denying the plaintiff long-term benefits under the relevant employee welfare benefit plan be affirmed. (Doc. # 54). The Report was filed on March 7, 2006. On March 23, 2006, plaintiff filed a motion for an extension of time to respond to the Report, and indicated that he had hired an a new attorney. (Doc. # 55). Over defendant’s objection (Doc. # 56), plaintiff’s request for an extension of time was granted by Order of the Court on March 27, 2006. (Doc. # 58). Plaintiff was given until April 7, 2006, to file any objections to the Report. To date, no objections have been filed.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in

whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. No objections have been filed to the Report. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983).

A review of the record indicates that the Report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. For the reasons set forth and articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. # 54), and the judgment of the defendant denying the plaintiff long-term benefits under the relevant employee welfare benefit plan is **AFFIRMED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
s/ Terry L. Wooten  
**TERRY L. WOOTEN**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

January 12, 2007  
Florence, South Carolina